



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/580,455

05/24/2006

Nigel David Timms

31229-231165

5510

26694

7590

11/17/2009

VENABLE LLP

P.O. BOX 34385

WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998

EXAMINER

MELLON, DAVID C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1797

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/17/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/580,455	Applicant(s) TIMMS ET AL.	
	Examiner DAVID C. MELLON	Art Unit 1797	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/6/2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,6,9-14,17 and 24-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,6,9-14,17 and 24-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. **Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Claim 9 recites the limitation "the fluid is a fuel" in line 1. There was never a previous positive recitation of a fluid in claim 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. **Claims 10, 12-14 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by McClenaghan et al. (EP 0976682 A2).**

Regarding claim 10, McClenaghan et al. discloses a magnetic treatment of fluids device (title and abstract) in figures 1-2 comprising:

- Two or more fluid channels (36, 38)
- Each fluid channel having at least one peripherally located magnet (16, 18)

- Wherein the at least one magnet is removably received in a body section of the device (C5/L1-12, C2/L18-26).

Regarding claim 12, McClenaghan et al. further discloses at least one internal magnet within the fluid channel (24).

Regarding claim 13, McClenaghan et al. further discloses the device is fitted within an existing fluid supply conduit (abstract).

Regarding claim 14, McClenaghan et al. further discloses the device comprises one or more internal replaceable magnetic cartridges (24) held in position inside the device by retaining means into which the removable magnet cartridges will slot, wherein the cartridges splits the fluid channel into subsidiary channels (see figure 2, also slots at C2/L18-26).

Regarding claim 27, McClenaghan et al. discloses a magnetic treatment of fluids device (title and abstract) in figures 1-2 comprising:

- A fluid channel adapted having an input and output connected with a fuel supply conduit (Abstract)
- Two or more fluid channels split from the input fluid channel (36, 38)
- Each fluid channel having at least one peripherally located magnet (16, 18)
- Wherein the fluid channel is dimensioned and configured to slow fuel flowing through (the splitting of the channel provides a barrier at 34 along with leading flow director plus see at [0033] that dimensions can be larger thus resulting in slowed feed).

Art Unit: 1797

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. **Claims 2, 6, 9, 17, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McClenaghan et al. (EP 0976682 A2).**

Art Unit: 1797

Regarding claims 2, 6, and 25-26 McClenaghan et al. discloses a magnetic treatment of fluids device (title and abstract) in figures 1-2 comprising:

- Two or more fluid channels (36, 38) coupled to input and output through a fuel supply conduit (abstract)
- Each fluid channel having at least one peripherally located magnet (16, 18)
- Wherein the at least one magnet is removably received in a body section of the device (C5/L1-12, C2/L18-26).

McClenaghan does not explicitly disclose a ratio of cross-sectional areas of the fluid supply conduit to the total cross sectional area of all the fluid channels in the range of 1:1.2-1:2.4. McClenaghan further establishes at [0033] that the channels can have a width of 5cms while the range of fuel pipe can be 7.5-10cm. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had a ratio as such since McClenaghan establishes that there is a difference in cross sectional areas, see in figure 1 also [0033], magnet separator housing is wider than the fluid conduit and to choose by routine experimentation the optimal ratios. Accordingly, one having ordinary skill in the art would have chosen a ratio as such to improve fluid exposure to magnetic fields. Furthermore, absent some showing of secondary evidence, the relative dimensional ratios of the cross sectional areas are not patentably distinct from the prior art teaching of McClenaghan because [W]here the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform

Art Unit: 1797

differently from the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device. *Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 220 USPQ 777 (1984).

Furthermore, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. Accordingly, Applicant has not established a criticality of the ratio variable.

Regarding claim 9, McClenaghan et al. further discloses treating fuel (Abstract).

Regarding claim 17, McClenaghan et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as set forth above.

McClenaghan does not explicitly disclose a ratio of cross-sectional areas of the fluid supply conduit to the total cross sectional area of all the fluid channels in the range of 1:1.2-1:2.4. McClenaghan further establishes at [0033] that the channels can have a width of 5cms while the range of fuel pipe can be 7.5-10cm. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had a ratio as such since McClenaghan establishes that there is a difference in cross sectional areas, see in figure 1 also [0033], magnet separator housing is wider than the fluid conduit and to choose by routine experimentation the optimal ratios. Accordingly, one having ordinary skill in the art would have chosen a ratio as such to improve fluid exposure to magnetic fields. Furthermore, absent some showing of secondary evidence, the relative dimensional ratios of the cross sectional areas are not patentably distinct from the prior art teaching of McClenaghan because [W]here the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the

Art Unit: 1797

claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently from the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device. *Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 220 USPQ 777 (1984).

Furthermore, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. Accordingly, Applicant has not established a criticality of the ratio variable.

Regarding claim 24, McClenaghan et al. further discloses treating the fluid at right angles to the magnets ([0017]).

9. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McClenaghan et al. (EP 0976682 A2) and further in view of Weisenbarger et al. (USP 4,711,271).

Regarding claim 11, McClenaghan et al. discloses all of the claim limitations as set forth above. McClenaghan et al. further discloses using as casing material one which does not become magnetized over time ([0030]), however does not explicitly disclose a non-ferrous material.

Weisenbarger et al. discloses a magnetic fluid conditioner (abstract) in figures 1 and 2 comprising a fluid channel (16) with peripherally mounted magnets (18a and 18b) with a non-ferrous plastic body (C2/L38-45) which is disclosed as used because it is non magnetic.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the casing of McClenaghan et al. by using a non-ferrous material as

Art Unit: 1797

taught by Weisenberger et al. for the purpose of providing a non-magnetic housing which cannot be magnetized and because it would be obvious to consider equivalent metals as it is taught in McClenaghan et al. that metals of similar properties may also be used.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID C. MELLON whose telephone number is (571)270-7074. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 9:00am-5:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vickie Kim can be reached on (571) 272-0579. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1797

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tony G Soohoo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797

/D. C. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 1797